

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

EMMANUEL QUENTIN WYLIE,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 19-CV-12586

v.

HON. GEORGE CARAM STEEH

CITY OF DETROIT,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF IN FORMA PAUPERIS STATUS  
AND DISMISSING CASE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)**

Plaintiff Emmanuel Quentin Wylie, proceeding *pro se*, has filed suit against the City of Detroit or its “unknown heirs, devisees, legatees and assigns.” Based upon the financial information in the Application to Proceed Without Prepaying Fees or Costs, the court grants Plaintiff *in forma pauperis* status pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. For the reasons that follow, however, the court dismisses Plaintiff’s Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)(ii).

An action brought *in forma pauperis* must be dismissed if the action “(i) is frivolous or malicious; [or] (ii) fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)(ii). A complaint may be dismissed as frivolous “where it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in

fact.” *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). To state a claim upon which relief may be granted, the complaint must contain a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). The standard under Rule 8 “does not require ‘detailed factual allegations,’ but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). In screening an action brought *in forma pauperis*, a court should be mindful that *pro se* complaints are to be liberally construed. *Boag v. MacDougall*, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (per curiam). Courts do not hold *pro se* filings to the same stringent standard as formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972).

Having carefully reviewed the Complaint, the court determines that it is frivolous and fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. The Complaint is captioned as a Complaint for “Condemnation,” and the claims are unintelligible and bereft of factual development. Plaintiff’s citations to the Code of Federal Regulations, the Uniform Commercial Code, the Uniform Arbitration Act, and Michigan law fail to set forth viable claims. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the above-captioned matter is DISMISSED.

Based on the preceding order, this court certifies that any appeal from this decision would be frivolous, not in good faith and, therefore, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), may not be taken *in forma pauperis*.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 12, 2019

s/George Caram Steeh  
GEORGE CARAM STEEH  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On September 12, 2019, copies of this Order were served upon attorneys of record and on Emmanuel Quentin Wylie, 17595 Meyers Rd., Detroit, MI 48235, by electronic and ordinary mail.

s/Barbara Radke  
Deputy Clerk